

Application No. 10/800,308  
Page 14 of 17

### Remarks

This communication responds to the Office Action mailed July 26, 2005, and to the Office Communication mailed October 31, 2005, for the application captioned above. By this amendment claims 1, 2, 25, 27-31, 49 and 51 are amended; it should be noted that amendments to claims 27-31 are corrections of typographical errors. Applicant respectfully requests entry and examination of new claims 54-59 asserting that, to the best of Applicant's knowledge, claims 54-59 are patentably distinct from the references cited herein. No new matter has been introduced as a result of this amendment. The following remarks are respectfully submitted

### §112 Rejection

Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention, because the phrase "the retention system" of the claim lacks antecedent basis. The examiner has assumed that the applicant meant for claim 27 to be dependent from claim 26 for the purposes of examination. Applicant is grateful to the Examiner for pointing out the typographical error in claim 27 and has corrected claim 27 to be dependent upon claim 26. In light of this correction, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 27.

### §102 Rejection

Claims 1, 2, 6-11, 15-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Allwein et al. (6,141,930). Applicant traverses the rejection of claims 1, 2, 6-11 and 15-21 based on the following argument.

Allwein et al. do not teach or suggest every element and limitation of claims 1, 2, 6-11 and 15-21. For example, independent claims 1 and 2 define an insulation blanket including a cover having a distal and proximal layer mated along *a lattice of longitudinal and latitudinal heat-sealed seams* that form a plurality of modules between the layers, the modules being

Application No. 10/800,308

Page 15 of 17

separated by the seams. Although Allwein et al. describe an insulation assembly (20), Allwein et al. describe the assembly as being formed of a series of elongated modules (22), separably joined together by connecting strips (26), likened by the Examiner to the heat-sealed seams of claims 1 and 2, being "coextensive in length with the individual elongated insulation modules" (column 6, lines 17-19); and Allwein et al. clearly show, in Figure 1, elongated insulation modules 22 extending substantially over a length L of insulation assembly 20. Thus, Allwein et al. neither teach nor suggest that connecting strips extend longitudinally *and* latitudinally in a lattice.

In light of the above argument, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1 and 2, claims 6-11, dependent upon claims 1 and 2, and claims 15-21, dependent upon claim 1.

#### §103 Rejection

Claims 3, 4, 5, 12, 13, 14, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allwein in view of Hall (5,362,539). Applicant traverses the rejection of claims 3, 4, 5, 12, 13, 14 and 22 based on the argument presented above for independent claims 1 and 2, upon which these claims depend, and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 3, 4, 5, 12, 13, 14 and 22.

Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allwein et al in view of Daubert et al (3,386,527). Applicant traverses the rejection of claim 23 based on the argument presented above for independent claims 1 and 2, upon which this claim depends, and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 23.

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allwein et al in view of Daubert et al (3,386,527) and further in view of Hall et al (5,362,539). Applicant traverses the rejection of claim 24 based on the argument presented above for independent claims 1 and 2, upon which this claim depends, and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 24.

Application No. 10/800,308

~~Page 16 of 17~~

Claims 25, 28, 29, 30, 49, 51 and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allwein et al in view of Sloan (5,779,193). Applicant traverses the rejection of claims 25, 28, 29, 30, 49, 51 and 53 based on the following arguments.

Neither of Allwein et al. and Sloan, alone or in combination, teach or suggest every element and limitation of independent claims 25, 49 and 51.

Independent claim 25 defines an insulated aircraft fuselage wherein a modular insulation blanket is affixed to an interior skin of the fuselage such that at least one strut of the fuselage is sandwiched between adjacent modules of the blanket and *a seam separating the adjacent modules extends across the strut*. Although Allwein et al. describe an insulation assembly (20), wherein connecting strips (26), likened by the Examiner to the heat-sealed seams, join a series of elongated modules (22), the connecting strips are not described as extending across a strut sandwiched between adjacent modules of the assembly. Rather, Allwein et al. describes detaching a panel of connected elongated insulation modules to insert within a cavity between framing members (reference column 8, lines 32-53), and then securing the panel to the framing members by passing a fastener through either an envelope of the module, or through a tab formed by the separation of the connecting strip between adjacent modules (reference column 8, lines 54-67); since the connecting strips at the edges of the panel adjacent the framing members has been separated, it no longer separates adjacent modules and does not extend across the framing member, as can be seen in Figures 4, 5, and 6 of Allwein et al. Although Sloan describes insulation for a passenger cabin of an aircraft, Sloan does not teach or suggest a strut of the aircraft fuselage being sandwiched between adjacent modules of a modular insulation blanket and a seam separating the adjacent modules extending across the strut. Rather, with reference to Figure 2, Sloan discloses individual insulating elements (18), contained within cells (16) formed by frames (12) and stringers (14) of a fuselage, and a plurality of frame-enclosing insulating elements (38).

Independent claims 49 and 51 describe an insulated aircraft component and an insulated structural component, respectively, each insulated component including a modular insulation blanket, the insulation blanket including a cover having a distal and proximal layer mated along

Application No. 10/800,308  
Page 17 of 17

*a lattice of longitudinal and latitudinal heat-sealed seams* that form a plurality of modules between the layers, the modules being separated by the seams. As previously described in the argument supporting traversal of the rejection of claims 1 and 2, Allwein et al. neither teach nor suggest of a modular insulating blanket including seams extending longitudinally *and* latitudinally in a lattice. Although Sloan describes insulation for a passenger cabin of an aircraft, Sloan neither teaches nor suggests an insulation blanket.

In light of the arguments presented above, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 25, claims 28-30, dependent upon claim 25, claim 49, claim 51, and claim 53, dependent upon claim 51.

Claims 26, 27, 31, 50, 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allwein in view of Hall (5,362,539) as applied above. Applicant traverses the rejection of claims 26, 27, 31, 50 and 52 based on the arguments presented above for claims 25, 40 and 51, and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 26, 27, 31, 50 and 52.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of the application are respectfully requested. Applicant believes no fee is due to enter the present Amendment. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional filing fees required to Deposit Account No. 061910. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if the Examiner believes it would be useful to advance prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 14, 2005



Elisabeth Lacy Belden  
Registration No. 50,751  
(612) 492-7843

Fredrikson & Byron, P.A.  
200 South Sixth Street, Suite 4000  
Minneapolis, MN 55402-1425 USA  
Facsimile: (612) 492-7077

#3195062A1